

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated January 7, 2004 (Paper No. 11). Claims 27 to 41 are pending in this application, with Claims 31 and 38 having been cancelled. Claims 27, 30, 32, 34, 37, 39 and 41 have been amended, and Claims 27, 34 and 41 are in independent form. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that Claims 31, 32, 38 and 39 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claims.

In maintaining his rejection of independent Claims 27, 34 and 41, the Office Action equated Lentz's step 810 of his "start address pointer strategy," in which the start address is updated if the amount of data read from the data FIFO 402 since the last time the start address was updated is large (See Lentz, Fig. 8, element 810), with the claimed modification of received data according to at least one predetermined criterion corresponding to the virtual interface. In keeping with the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 31 and 38, Applicants have amended the rejected independent claims to include the functionality of Claims 31 and 38. Specifically, in each of Claims 27, 34 and 41, as amended, data is modified "according to at least one filtering pattern selected in accordance with the address of the virtual interface." Consequently, independent Claims 27, 34 and 41 as amended are seen to be in condition for allowance.

The Office Action entered rejections of Claims 27 to 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,444,853 (Lentz). The foregoing actions have been taken

without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and without conceding correctness of the rejections, but rather strictly to obtain an earlier allowance.

The other claims in the application are each dependent from the independent claims and are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Finally, as to a formal matter, the Office Action has still made no mention of the Information Disclosure Statement dated February 21, 2002. However, since the Information Disclosure Statement was filed in conformity with the applicable rules and guidelines, Applicants assume that it has been entered and considered. Applicants once again request that the Examiner return an initialed copy of the Form PTO-1449 which accompanied the February 21, 2002 Information Disclosure Statement.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 32622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 77592v1